

**REMARKS**

In accordance with the foregoing, the pending claims have been amended to clarify the invention and to improve form and, further, new claims 14-17 are presented. Further, responsive to Item 1 of the Action, a new Title is presented which is submitted to be clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

No new matter is presented and, accordingly, approval and entry of the foregoing amended Title, amended and new claims and substitute Abstract are respectfully requested.

**ITEM 2: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-7 AND 10-11 FOR ANTICIPATION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b) BY YUKATA (JP 10-224772)**

The rejection is respectfully traversed.

By the amendments, the following features are believed to be clarified in each of independent claims 1, 3, 6 and 11:

detecting motion of a video image captured by a camera by processing image data of the video image;

generating camera operation information concerning an operation of the camera from the detected motion of the video image; and

performing the above-defined detecting and generating functions in one (i.e., a controlled, or first) apparatus.

According to the present invention, in a controlled (first) apparatus, a motion of a video image captured by a camera is detected by processing image data of the video image, and camera operation information concerning an operation of the camera is generated from the detected motion of the video image. In a specific embodiment of the invention, shown in FIGS. 5A-5C (page 11, lines 4-22), as a camera performs PAN, TILT, or ZOOM operations, corresponding motion vectors are generated in each of macro blocks forming a screen as indicated by arrows in each of FIGS. 5A-5C. By detecting and processing these motion vectors, motion of the camera is determined. (See discussion, pages 11-12 and particularly at page 12, lines 25-28).

It is respectfully submitted that Yukata fails to disclose the foregoing features of the independent claims 1, 3, 6 and 11.

First, there is no disclosure in Yutaka that a motion of a video image captured by a camera is detected by processing image data of the video image. From paragraph [0023] of

Yutaka, it is assumed, in Yutaka, that an image is displayed in the local system 14 based on the motion of a camera calculated based on condition data and actuation data in the data-processing section 11 of the local system 14. However, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Yutaka that condition data or actuation data is motion of a video image captured by a camera detected by processing image data of the video image in a controlled apparatus.

Further, assuming *arguendo* that the condition data or actuation data of Yukata is motion of a video image captured by a camera detected by processing image data of the video image in a controlled apparatus, the motion of a camera, which may correspond to camera operation information, is calculated in the local system 14 of Yukata - - which is not a controlled apparatus, but rather a control apparatus.

Furthermore, assuming *arguendo* that condition data of Yukata is camera operation information, as the Examiner asserts, condition data cannot be generated from motion of a video image according to Yutaka. According to Yutaka, condition data is output from the camera control section 2 of the remote system S. If condition data should be detected from an image, an input from the camera section 1 to the camera control section 2 would be required. However, no such input is disclosed or suggested in Yutaka. Accordingly, it is impossible, in Yutaka, to determine the condition of the camera from an image.

Further, as described above, the data-processing section 11 of Yutaka merely "calculates a motion of a camera with condition data and actuation data, starts partial image 32b ..., and outputs it to the image output section 1311 (paragraph [00233]) as display data." The data-processing section 11 of Yutaka does not process the image data based on camera operation information generated from detected motion of the video image.

Accordingly, for the above-described reasons, it is submitted that the independent claims 1, 3, 6, and 11 patentably distinguish over Yukata and, further, that the respective dependent claims 2, 4-5, 7-10, and 12 and 13, which inherit the respective recitations of their independent claims 1, 3, 6, and 11, as well patentably distinguish over Yukata for the same reasons and, further, for the patentably distinguishing features set forth in those dependent claims.

### **ITEM 3: REJECTION OVER CLAIM 12 FOR OBVIOUSNESS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) OVER YUKATA**

Since claim 12 depends from independent claim 11, which is shown hereinabove to distinguish patentably over Yukata, it is respectfully submitted that claim 12/11, which inherits the patentably distinguishing features of claim 11, as well is patentable over Yukata and, in addition, in view of the patentably distinguishing features recited therein.

## CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it submitted that the pending claims 1-13 patentably distinguish over the rejections and reference of record and, there being no other objections or rejections, that the application is in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.


If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: February 10, 2005

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
H. J. Staas  
Registration No. 22,010

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501